



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,324	05/25/2000	Thomas Nello Giaccherini	HDM2000-1	7267
7590	10/04/2004		EXAMINER	
Anglin & Giaccherini Post Office Box 1146 Carmel Valley, CA 93924				LY, ANH VU H
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2667	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/579,324	GIACCHERINI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anh-Vu H Ly	2667

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: ____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on ____ is a)a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues on page 4 that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Pico and Fenwick to derive the claimed invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Picco discloses in Fig. 3, a satellite based television system for distributing programming data stream to a plurality of viewers. Further, Picco discloses (see final office action) that the programming data stream can be downloaded during night time when the bandwidth demand is low. Fenwick discloses (see Abstract) a menuing system for a video distribution system which provides an interactive display to allow a user to select and control the delivery of program material. Herein, delivering program material means presenting the program material to the users. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the features such as allowing a user to select and control the deliver of program material to the user in Picco's systems, wherein, program materials might have been already downloaded from the source via satellite system when the bandwidth demand is low such as at nights, as suggested by Fenwick, to fulfill the desires of the recipients thereby the recipients can watch the selected program instanteneously without waiting for the programs to be downloaded. Examiner recognizes the fact that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Picco and Fenwick thereby downloading time can be shortened and the viewers can have the option to select the desired program material from the menuing system.



CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800 9/30/04